

Remarks

Claims 1-33 were presented for prosecution and remain pending.

In the Office Action, claims 2-5, 12-13, 18-21 and 33 are objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in an independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicant gratefully appreciates this indication.

Applicant initially submits that in the summary of the Office Action (at page 1), claim 23 is listed as being objected to, but no reason for the objection has been provided in the detailed action. Applicant respectfully requests clarification.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 7, 10, 17, 26 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Pauls, US 6,025,888 ("Pauls"); and claims 7-9, 11, 14-16, 22, 24-25, 27 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Pauls in view of Hagai et al., US 6,414,972 ("Hagai"). Applicant respectfully traverses those rejections for the reasons stated below.

With respect to independent claims 1, 10, 17, 26 and 32, Applicant submits that Pauls does not disclose each and every claimed feature. For example, the claimed invention includes, *inter alia*, "determining a relative importance of each macroblock in a video frame based on how often each macroblock acts as a reference macroblock[,]" as recited in claim 1 and claimed similarly in claims 10, 17, 26 and 32. Applicant submits that Pauls does not disclose, *inter alia*, this feature.

Pauls "select[s] for intra-coded transmission those macroblocks which are predicted to be most likely to improve the decoded image quality." (Col. 4, lines 58-60). Pauls measures "the relative importance of a particular macroblock position in terms of

its impact on decoded video image quality.” (Col. 4, lines 62-64). That is, Pauls determines the relative importance of a macroblock position based on its impact on decoded video image quality, not based on how often each macroblock acts as a reference macroblock.

In addition, Pauls does not disclose a macroblock acting as a reference macroblock because the macroblocks are selected for intra-coded transmission in Pauls. As is well known in the art and admitted in Pauls, an intra-coded frame is not encoded using a reference macroblock. (See col. 1, lines 36-45). As a consequence, “intra-coded macroblocks do not depend on any other macroblock from a previous or subsequent frame[.]” (Col. 4, lines 50-52 of Pauls). Pauls purposefully do not use predictive coding (that uses reference macroblocks) to remove accumulated error effects. (See col. 1, line 64 – col. 2, line 3). As such, Pauls does not teach a macroblock acting as a reference macroblock.

By sharp contrast, the claimed invention includes predictive coding and determines a relative importance of each macroblock in a video frame based on how often each macroblock acts as a reference macroblock.

In view of the foregoing, Pauls does not anticipate the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.


In the Office Action, the Office asserts that “the relative importance ... may then be used as a reference to determine which macro-block is likely to benefit most from an intra-coded macroblock[.]” (Office Action at page 2, *citing* Pauls at col. 4, line 60 - col. 5, line 2). Applicant respectfully submits this assertion is irrelevant because the claimed invention claims determining a relative importance of a macroblock in a video frame

based on how often the macroblock acts as a reference macroblock, but does not claim using the relative importance as a reference. The Office only asserts that Pauls uses the relative importance as a reference to select a macroblock, but does not even assert that Pauls determines a relative importance of a macroblock based on how often the macroblock acts as a reference macroblock. Please note, a reference macroblock is related to predictive coding, which Pauls does not disclose.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: 1/19/06

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Hoffman
Reg. No. 40,019

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)